## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/207,188

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

Blake et al.

S. Devi, Ph.D.

1645

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) <u>S. Devi (PTO)</u>	(3) Darryl Steensma
(2) Ken Sonnenfeld	(4) Lynette Smith
Date of Interview May 17, 2001	<del>-</del>
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes	e) No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: All of record.	
Identification of prior art discussed:	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Mr. Sonnenfeld stated that the parent case was allowed with the language "about 3" in the claim. He stated that Reimer et al. was applied in the parent case under 35 USC 102 and was later withdrawn by the previous Examiner. He stated that it was improper to object to the same claim language in a Divisonal application. He was told that each case is prosecuted on its own merits. He was assured that the parent case would be ordered for a review of the prosecution by the time he files his response and that the issue would be discussed with other officials in the Office if needed. Mr. Sonnenfeld stated that he would file a response to the Office Action.	
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no cavailable, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORM, INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPI	EP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has

12 Joyel 25

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.